

REMARKS**I. Introduction**

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application, of which claims 4-11 have been withdrawn from consideration pursuant to the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.142(b). In this Amendment, claims 1, 12, and 13 have been amended. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter. Specifically, support for the amendments to claims 1 and 12 can be found in, for example, the first full paragraph on page 3, and the paragraph bridging pages 12 and 13, of the specification.

Claims 1-3 and 12-17 are now active for examination, of which claims 1 and 12 are independent. Entry of the present Amendment is respectfully solicited.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-3 and 12-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blumenau et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,260,120, hereinafter “Blumenau”) in view of McClannahan (U.S. Patent No. 6,438,670, hereinafter “McClannahan”).

Applicants submit that Blumenau and McClannahan, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest a host device including all the limitations recited in independent claim 1, as amended. Specifically, the applied combination does not teach, among other things, the following limitations recited in claim 1 (emphasis shows changes):

wherein the controller obtains information for estimating time necessary to execute the command from the storage device prior to the issuance of the command, sets a wait time for the command based on the obtained information, issues the command to the storage device via a bus electrically connecting the host device and the storage device, releases the bus for another command, and waits the time set for the command before it issues a command for the next procedure to the storage device.

In the Office Action, the Examiner admitted, “Blumenau does not explicitly teach the controller obtains information for estimating time necessary to execute the command from the storage device prior to the issuance of the command, sets a wait time for the command based on the obtained information, issues the command to the storage device, and waits the time set for the command before it issues a command for the next procedure to the storage device” (the paragraph bridging pages 5 and 6 of the Office Action). However, the Examiner asserted that McClannahan teaches the missing features of Blumenau, and concluded that it would have been obvious to modify the host controller of Blumenau based on the teachings of McClannahan to arrive at the claimed subject matter.

As argued in the May 27, 2008 reply, McClannahan simply teaches having a predetermined time parameter that defines a minimum delay between first and second memory control operations by using a programmable delay counter (see column 3, lines 22-33; column 5, lines 12-25; and column 6, lines 5-25, cited by the Examiner). It is apparent that McClannahan does not teach a controller which “issues the command to the storage device via a bus electrically connecting the host device and the storage device, releases the bus for another command, and waits the time set for the command before it issues a command for the next procedure to the storage device,” as claimed.

The claimed subject matter can provide the following advantages: since the cryptographic input/output processing is divided into a plurality of procedures and the commands into smaller units, it is possible to release buses efficiently and issue other commands while executing processing that requires a relatively long time, such as encryption, decryption, a hash operation, random number generation, and log retrieval (the first full paragraph on page 3 of the specification). McClannahan does not teach such advantages.

Further, as admitted by the Examiner, Blumenau does not teach the above-discussed claimed limitations and advantages, and thus, does not cure the deficiencies of McClannahan.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants submit that Blumenau and McClannahan, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest a host device including all the limitations recited in independent claim 1. The above discussion is applicable to independent claim 12. Dependent claims 2, 3, and 13-17 are also patentably distinguishable over Blumenau and McClannahan at the least because these claims include all the limitations recited in independent claims 1 and 12, respectively. Applicants, therefore, respectfully solicit withdrawal of the rejection of claims and favorable consideration thereof.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, Applicants submit that this application should be allowed and the case passed to issue. If there are any questions regarding this Amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated to expedite the prosecution of the application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper,

10/809,789

including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Tomoki Tanida

Registration No. 60,453

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 SAB:TT:amz
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: November 6, 2008

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**